

REMARKS

[002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-53 are currently pending
- No claims are canceled herein
- No claims are withdrawn herein
- Claims 1, 22, 27, 33, 38, 42, 47, and 50 are amended herein
- No claims are added herein

Claims 22-26 Recite Statutory Subject Matter Under § 101

[003] Claims 22-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[004] Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without commenting on the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claims 22-26 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the § 101 rejection moot.

Cited Documents

[005] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- *Wenocur*. *Wenocur et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0009694

- *Lennon: Lennon et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0152267

Wenocur Fails to Anticipate Claims 1-26

[006] Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Wenocur. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[007] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Specifically, Wenocur does not disclose the claimed, “a component configured to convert communications in the first form compatible with the first interface to the second form compatible with the second interface which is incompatible with the first form.”

[008] Claim 1 recites in part, “a component configured to convert communications in the first form compatible with the first interface to the second form compatible with the second interface which is incompatible with the first form.” However, Wenocur is neither cited for nor discloses the foregoing recital of claim 1. Instead, Wenocur merely describes a “storyteller” application (Wenocur, paragraph 0123 for instance). Applicant respectfully submits that Wenocur fails to describe a programming interface for developing the storyteller application much less a programming interface for developing programs having “a component configured to convert communications in the first form compatible with the first interface to the second form compatible with the second interface which is incompatible with the first form,” as recite by claim 1.

[009] Consequently, Wenocur does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Wenocur does not anticipate this claim, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-21

[0010] Claims 2-21 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited documents, and is therefore allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-21 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the subject claims.

Claims 22-26

[0011] For reasons similar to those set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 22-26 are also allowable over Wenocur. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the subject claims.

Lennon Fails to Anticipate Claims 27-53

[0012] Claims 27-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lennon. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 27

[0013] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 27 is moot. Specifically, Lennon does not disclose the claimed, “converting a communication associated with the first type or the first function from the first form to the second form whereby a plurality of diverse applications which use incompatible interfaces can be developed using the programming interface.”

[0014] Claim 27 recites in part, “converting a communication associated with the first type or the first function from the first form to the second form whereby a plurality of diverse applications which use incompatible interfaces can be developed using the programming interface.” However, Lennon is neither cited for nor discloses the foregoing recital of claim 27. Instead, Lennon merely discloses a single user interface that facilitates browsing and searching different metadata collections over the Internet (see the Abstract).

[0015] Consequently, Lennon does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Lennon does not anticipate this claim, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 28-32

[0016] Claims 28-32 ultimately depend from independent claim 27. As discussed above, claim 27 is not anticipated by the cited documents, and is therefore *allowable* over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 28-32 are also *allowable* over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from *an allowable* base claim. These

claims may also be *allowable* for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the subject claims.

Claims 33-53

[0017] For reasons similar to those set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 33-53 are also allowable over Lennon. These claims may also be *allowable* for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the subject claims.

Conclusion

[0018] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

_____/Robert L. Villhard/

Dated: July 28, 2009

Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5005)
Registration No. 53725

Reviewer/Supervisor: *Robert C. Peck* (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)
Registration No. 56826.